

S.R.30
UDOT Project # S-R199(185)

Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2 Results

Meeting Date: January 10, 2017
Meeting Location: Logan Environmental Center, 153 N 1400 W
Meeting Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 pm

Purpose of the meeting:

- To update the group on the status of the study
- To present the results of level one screening and gather input
- To present proposed roadway cross sections and alignments and gather input
- To discuss the level two screening process, key criteria and requirements

**See meeting PPT slides for additional details to support results*

I. Attendance

- Stakeholder Working Group members
 - Mark Nielsen, Logan City
 - Josh Runhaar, Cache Co.
 - Jeff Gilbert, CMPO
 - Brent Miller, LW Miller C Store
 - Todd Meyers, Maverik Store / Corporate
 - Larry Olsen, Area resident
 - Bryan Dixon, Bear River Land Conservancy
 - Dayton Crites, Cache Co. Trails
 - Richard Mueller, Bridgerland Audubon Society
 - Eve Davies, Pacificorp
- UDOT
 - Rod Terry, UDOT / Project Mgr.
 - Naomi Kisen, UDOT / Environmental
- HDR - Vince Izzo, Consultant Project Manager
- KMP - Mike Pepper, Public Involvement Lead

II. Study Status Update

- Activities since SWG meeting #1 – Mike gave a brief overview of the activities completed since the last SWG meeting.
- SWG meeting #1 results – Final comments – no additional changes to the meeting results. The Group indicated the results content and level of detail met their needs.

III. Level One Screening Results

- Alternatives screened – Vince presented the list of alternatives that were screened in Level 1. He reminded the Group that the alternatives were developed based in part on input received from stakeholders, public scoping, local governments, agencies, etc.

- Level 1 screening criteria – Vince overviewed the Level 1 screening criteria, which is based on the approved Purpose and Need. He explained to the Group that Level 1 screening is basically a “pass/fail” evaluation for UDOT LOS goals and UDOT safety standards
 - o Study team comments regarding the Level 1 screening process and results
 - The question was asked if FHWA is okay with the results. UDOT noted that they expect to have NEPA assignment from FHWA in the near future.
 - UDOT recognizes that the successful EIS outcome must also be fundable, permissible, and have political support
 - o Group comments regarding the Level 1 screening results
 - Alt 8 – Bridge / Couplet
 - Why was the bridge / couplet alternative proposed, assuming it would be very expensive? Was this a USACE preference? Answer – this was proposed in response to EPA interest in reducing wetland impacts, while meeting LOS goals
 - Consider a double decker bridge to further reduce wetland impacts, although it is assumed this would be very high cost
 - 6C will support improvements at the RR crossing
 - Passing lane options; 6A through 6E – transition and merges will cause safety problems
 - Answer - Construction and Engineering will strive to minimize transition confusion, including the use of advance signage
 - Consider long term impacts – build for future generations
 - [The Group supports the Level 1 screening results and alternatives as proposed for Level 2 screening](#)

IV. Preliminary Roadway Concept Design

- Roadway cross sections that would cover all alternatives were presented
 - o General comments regarding cross sections
 - City asked if trees would be allowed in the 5-ft. park strip
 - If trees are not allowed, then suggest building a 6-ft. sidewalk and remove the park strip
 - Study team - Definition of the “Clear Zone”
 - 30 ft. from edge of shoulder to any obstruction, including water
 - Will allow trees up to 2” diameter
 - Clear zone causes maintenance issues
 - Study team - Center median - the 30-ft. unpaved center median (if used) can also collect runoff water from the inside lanes to filter before entering the marsh
- Intersection cross section options for 1000 W and SR 23 were presented
 - o 1000 W / Study team comments regarding the 1000 W intersection cross sections
 - UDOT prefers a single E/W left turn lane at 1000 W.
 - A meeting with property owners at the SR 30 / 1000 W intersection is scheduled for Monday, January 23 at 3 p.m. at LW Miller main office conference room. LW Miller and Maverik have already been invited and accepted.
 - **Action:** Suggest inviting representative of the Fur Breeders Ag. Coop (property owner on SE corner of SR 30/1000 W intersection) to the meeting.

- **Done – KMP 1-11-17 - Todd Hawkes will attend**
- 1000 W / Group comments regarding the 1000 W intersection cross section
 - If a single E/W turn lane is constructed first, any subsequent construction of a double left turn lane would cause an undesirable second round of construction impacts
 - LW Miller had requested investigation of signal timing at the intersection. Consider adding 10 seconds to the E to NB left turn movement.
 - **Action:** UDOT noted that this signal does respond to traffic volumes, but will evaluate further.
- SR 23 / Study team comments regarding the SR 23 intersection cross section options
 - Traffic volume information indicates this intersection will fail in the future
 - The Michigan Left option with bridges (over SR 30) is anticipated to have low left turn volumes from SR 23 onto SR 30
- SR 23 / Group comments regarding the SR 23 intersection cross section options
 - Accommodate the existing creek under SR 30, west of SR 23 in all options
 - Michigan left turn option
 - Need ample left turn stacking distance
 - This is a confusing option, may not be clear to drivers on what to do, especially when visibility is low, such as in foggy conditions
 - Signage would be very important to decrease confusion
 - Consider installing advance flashers if a traffic signal is installed in the future
 - Suggest keeping the standard 4 lanes on SR 30.
 - This intersection can be avoided by local traffic, who don't want to cross SR 30
 - If SR 30 is expanded to 4 lanes, crossing on SR 23 will be more difficult
 - There is an existing well on the NW corner of SR 23/SR 30
 - Final determination should also include a cost comparison between options and a cost / benefit analysis
 - Consider staged development of these intersection improvements, as warranted by traffic volumes
- Roadway alignments
 - Group comments regarding any **north shift** in the final roadway alignment
 - Canal on north side of roadway. May be historic.
 - **Action:** Contact Jeff Kunzler (Cow Pasture Irrigation Co.) for more input
 - Consider piping the canal. Although some adjacent property owners have noted that the canal also provides a drinking water source for livestock. Piping would prevent this opportunity.
 - There is a PacifiCorp shrub site, immediately west of 4000 W, for about .2 miles west
 - Construction should also resolve water movement conflicts. These were noted along SR-30 just west of SR-23 regarding water draining from the hillside and road and the creek that crosses SR-23 approximately 180 feet to the north of SR-30.
 - Group comments regarding any **south shift** in the final roadway alignment

- PacifiCorp recreation access sites are on the south side of SR 30. It is assumed by PacifiCorp that any impact to these sites will be addressed as part of a roadway project. Any project impacting these sites will also consider the requirements as part of the PacifiCorp FERC license.
- Both north and south shifts - Plan the alignment to cause the least harm and cost

V. **Bicycle Use Alternatives**

- Individual comments from the Group regarding bicycle use alternatives to be advanced for further screening
 - A shoulder path only will not provide an enhanced bike use facility due to continued safety concerns because of the proximity of bike riders to vehicles
 - Prefer a two-way separated path – 10 ft. pavement, plus 1 ft. each side for slope/drainage (12 ft. total width). (Note further investigation into AASHTO Standards for bike trails indicate a 2 foot 6:1 shoulder is required.)
 - Note that this option would be located on one side of SR 30 only
 - Consider developing this option in 2 phases if needed; Phase 1 would include the separated path with buffer as described above wherever possible as part of this project. Expanding the remaining narrow (shoulder path) areas as part of Phase 2 would include evaluation of wetland impacts in a subsequent process
 - Maximize separation from the roadway, minimize any narrow separation areas. Wider separation where possible, but would accept varied separation distance including narrower areas where needed.
 - Suggest the path be located on the south side of SR 30 to provide access to marina and other existing recreation / water access sites
 - Speed limits may be affected by the proximity of a bike path to the roadway
 - Consider applying the cost savings from not including a bike facility on SR 30 to improve Mendon Rd. for bike use. Not sure if this is allowable. And, shared bike/vehicle use on Mendon Rd. may not be compatible
 - “Don’t let perfect be the enemy of the good”, when making final plans regarding a bike facility
 - Consider connectivity to existing sites, such as the marsh, marina, etc., when planning and design a bike facility
 - Consider right of way and property owner impacts when planning and design a bike facility
- Study team comments regarding bicycle use alternatives for further screening
 - A bike path can be in the clear zone.
 - Note: Further discussion after the meeting with UDOT staff indicates that no barrier would be needed for a bike path within the clear zone.
 - If a bike facility is added in the clear zone, the clear zone might need to be widened to accommodate the required slope. This issue needs more investigation
 - Snow plowing/removal is an issue. If UDOT doesn’t do this, it is not likely that the City or County will do winter maintenance. A seasonal closure that would remove the need for snow removal will likely be acceptable, especially in the short term
 - Note: It is not UDOT’s practice to remove snow from bike paths
 - 1900 W to 1000 W would include a shoulder and sidewalk only
 - Three general types of bike facilities discussed;

- Urban section; shoulder and sidewalk
 - Shoulder path only
 - 2-way separated path; located in or immediately adjacent to the clear zone
- The Group agreed to advance two bike facility options for further evaluation;
 - **Option 1** - *Shoulder path throughout*
 - **Option 2** – *Separated, 2-way 10 ft. wide paved path located within a widened shoulder; either just inside or just outside the edge of the clear zone*
 - *One side of highway only*
 - *Note that the urban section is shoulder only, plus 5 ft. sidewalk*

VI. Level Two Screening

- Vince gave an overview of the Level 2 Screening process and key criteria and the key regulatory requirements. He also clarified the meaning of 4F and 6F status.
 - 4F – properties eligible for historic status or recreational sites.
 - 6F – recreation properties that have been improved with funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Miscellaneous issues when considering impacts
 - Three recreation sites exist in the study area; Cutler Marsh recreation site, Logan River recreation site and the North Marsh access.
 - These sites are owned and operated by PacifiCorp
 - Relicensing of these projects through FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) is anticipated to begin in approximately one year
 - The state of Utah may have contributed funds for development of recreation sites in the corridor
 - USFWS is a partner (and along with the UFWs may have contributed funding) in the development and operation of the existing Pacificorp recreation sites. Any changes to these sites would need to be addressed in the upcoming FERC relicensing process

VII. Final Discussion, Actions and Next Steps

- Other issues
 - City questions what potential project items would be out of UDOT scope and what items may be considered “betterment”. Who would provide funds for these items?
 - CMPO suggested preserving right of way now to accommodate any future buildout of desired or planned features. With right of way in place, other funding sources could be pursued, including by the CMPO.
- Next SWG meeting – Late February / early March – to be announced
 - Purpose:
 - Present Level Two screening results and gather input
 - Present update on bicycle use alternatives evaluation
- **Other actions**
 - Hold 1000 W / SR 30 intersection planning meeting on Monday, January 23, 3:00 p.m. at LW Miller main office conference room. All participants have been notified.
 - Participation to include Brent Miller, LW Miller; Todd Meyers, Maverik, Todd Hawkes, Fur Breeders Ag. Cooperative, Rod Terry, UDOT, other UDOT staff as needed, Vince Izzo, HDR; Mike Pepper, KMP Planning.
- Final discussion and adjourn at 3:20 p.m.